UNITED
NATIONS

E

Economic and Social
Council

Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.15/1996/16/Add.1
22 March 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

COMMISSION ON CRIME PREVENTION
AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE
Fifth session
Vienna, 21-31 May 1996
Item 7 of the provisional agenda*

UNITED NATIONS STANDARDS AND NORMS IN THE FIELD OF CRIME PREVENTION AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Report of the Secretary-General

Addendum

USE AND APPLICATION OF THE STANDARD MINIMUM RULES FOR THE TREATMENT OF PRISONERS

Summary

This report has been prepared in response to Economic and Social Council resolution 1993/34. It contains information received from Governments and other sources on the use and application of the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners, in accordance with Council resolutions 663 (XXIV) and 1984/47. Drawing on the experience gained from previous surveys, the present one takes into account the specific recommendations made by the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice. The results of the survey should provide a standard of comparison by which to assess the progress and needs of each country and thus direct the course of future action by the Commission.

*E/CN.15/1996/1.

V.96-81737T

CONTENTS

	Paragraphs	Pages
INTRODUCTION	1-4	2
I. RESULTS OF THE SURVEY	5-65	3
A. Number of persons held in custody	5	3
B. Registration, separation of categories and classification	6-12	5
C. Accommodation, personal hygiene, bedding and food	13-26	6
D. Prison work	27-30	9
E. Education and recreation	31-36	10
F. Medical services	37-41	11
G. Privileges and discipline or restraint	42-50	12
H. Information to and complaints by prisoners	51-53	13
I. Inspection	54-55	14
J. Legal counselling	56-57	14
K. Contact with the outside world	58-60	14
L. Religion	61-63	15
M. Institutional personnel	64	16
N. Social relations and after-care	65	16
II. ROLE OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS	66-67	16
III. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	68-70	17
IV. CONCLUSIONS	71-72	17
Annex. Specialists employed in the prison systems		19

Tables

1. Number of persons held in custody at 31 December 1993 (or nearest possible date) 4
2. Maximum number of prisoners at present in one dormitory room 7
3. Maximum size of dormitory rooms 7
4. Floor space per prisoner 8
5. Cubic air space per prisoner 8
6. Frequency of entitlement to bath or shower 9
7. Requests for assistance 17

INTRODUCTION

1. The Economic and Social Council, in its resolution 1993/34, section III, requested the Secretary-General to commence a process of information-gathering to be undertaken by means of surveys, initially paying attention to, *inter alia*, the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners.[1] In pursuance of the above request, the Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Division elaborated a draft questionnaire on the use and application of the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners, which was submitted to the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice at its third session for consideration. The questionnaire reflects the views of the Commission as expressed at its past three sessions, particularly that

an in-depth understanding of the use and application of the Standard Minimum Rules has to be based on precise, comparable and quantifiable information on how the Rules are applied in practice, including knowledge on how prison regimes deal with a variety of concrete aspects of prison life and prison management. Accordingly, the Economic and Social Council, in its resolution 1994/18, endorsed the questionnaire, containing more detailed, carefully designed and differentiated questions.

2. This report provides a summary of the responses received from 72 countries.* Replies were also received from the Holy See and from two non-governmental organizations, i.e. Penal Reform International, which provided information on the use and application of the Standard Minimum Rules in Uganda, and the Andean Commission of Jurists, which reported on the application of the Rules in Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela.

3. Previously, the Secretary-General submitted quinquennial reports on the implementation of the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners to the United Nations congresses on the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders.** The last of these reports, which was submitted to the Eighth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (A/CONF.144/11), contained updated information on the use and application of the Rules for the period 1985-1989, based on 49 replies received from Governments. The structure of the earlier reports was designed to provide information on general trends with regard to the treatment of prisoners, including overviews of general principles of imprisonment and prison services in Member States.

4. In principle, comparison of the information analysed in the present report with the results obtained from the previous ones should reveal broad global trends. However, the different design and content of the new questionnaire, as well as the fact that only 43 per cent of the countries contacted responded to both surveys limit the possibility of comparisons.

I. RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

A. Number of persons held in custody

5. Almost all countries provided information on the number of persons held in penal institutions, whether pre-trial detainees, sentenced prisoners or persons held for other reasons. A summary of the information received is contained in table 1. Figures for the years 1986 and 1990 are contained in the interim report prepared by the Secretariat on the results of the Fourth United Nations Survey on Crime Trends and

---

*Armenia, Australia, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Netherlands, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Turkey, Ukraine, United States of America, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Vanuatu and Venezuela.

**See the working paper prepared by the Secretariat on the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners in the light of recent developments in the correctional field (A/CONF.43/3); the working paper prepared by the Secretariat on the treatment of offenders, in custody or in the community, with special reference to the Standard Minimum Rules (A/CONF.56/6); the working paper prepared by the Secretariat on the implementation of the Standard Minimum Rules (A/CONF.87/11 and Add.1); and the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the Standard Minimum Rules (A/CONF.121/15 and Add.1).

Table 1. Number of persons held in custody at 31 December 1993 (or nearest possible date)

Country	*Pre-trial detainees*	*Sentenced prisoners*	*Others*	*Total*	*No. of prisoners per 100,000 inhabitants*
Armenia	1 912	3 442	..	5 364	143.73
Australia	2 397	15 414	10	17 821	100.91
Barbados	110	528	..	628	237.88
Belarus	10 507	31 593	..	42 100	413.23
Belgium	2 589	3 711	1 120	7 420	74.13
Cameroon	8 963	8 942	325	18 230	145.58
Chile	10 029	8 176	1 773	19 978	144.63
Colombia	16 331	12 070	150	28 551	79.42
Costa rica	538	2 922	145	3 605	112.69
Côte d'Ivoire	3 162	9 028	25	12 215	91.73
Croatia	658	1 648	..	2 306	51.12
Cyprus	159	5	..	164	20.87
Czech Republic	7 810	8 757	..	16 567	160.41
Denmark	860	2 265	70	3 195	61.57
Finland	243	3 079	..	3 322	65.56
France	21 949	31 114	..	53 063	92.48
Germany	21 785	34 679	3 502	59 966	77.43
Greece	2 091	4 777	16	6 884	66.80
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	25 248	76 553	..	101 801	158.65
Ireland	118	1 894	..	2 012	56.47
Israel	465	5 815	..	6 280	119.48
Italy	25 497	24 851	1 348	51 696	90.60
Jamaica	1 320	2 206	567	4 093	169.76
Japan	..	39 220	118	..	..
Jordan	1 568	2 181	..	3 749	75.95
Republic of Korea	23 990	31 169	..	55 159	125.20
Latvia	3 161	6 296	..	9 457	365.70
Lebanon	2 443	1 337	..	3 780	134.71
Liechtenstein	4	..	5	9	30.00
Luxembourg	162	254	2	418	110.00
Malawi	5	2 383	2 297	4 685	51.29
Malaysia	4 981	13 634	1 235	19 850	103.18
Malta	74	117	2	193	.53.46
Marshall Islands	10	34	112	156	300.00
Mauritius	255	671	..	926	84.88
Mongolia	800	5 285	..	6 085	262.51
Morocco	12 365	25 076	2 626	40 067	153.70
Myanmar	10 947	42 248	..	53 195	119.28
Netherlands	2 944	2 980	2 010	7 934	51.86
Pakistan	48 500	23 400	1 050	72 950	59.40
Philippines	17 932	17 932	..	35 864	54.63
Portugal	3 850	7 402	..	11 252	114.07
Qatar	187	340	..	527	94.28
Romania	19 425	21 816	2 749	43 990	193.32
Russian Federation	239 802	674 000	..	913 802	618.44
San Marino	3	2	1 211	5	20.83
Saudi Arabia	..	7 939	..	..	..
Singapore	295	5 767	298	7 273	253.06
Slovakia	1 903	5 372	..	7 275	136.80
South Africa	21 540	92 209	..	114 047	287.57
Sri Lanka	5 472	5 823	371	11 666	66.21
Sweden	1 043	4 418	..	5 461	62.68
Switzerland	1 851	4 040	2 209	5 891	84.91
Tajikistan	955	3 248	..	4 203	72.88
Thailand	18 046	73 397	..	93 652	159.86
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	225	953	..	1 178	55.59
Tonga	5	80	..	85	86.73
Turkey	18 766	15 589	..	34 355	57.04
Uganda[a]	15 127	[b]3 952	..	19 079	95.68
Ukraine	38 693	121 899	.	160 592	307.77
United Kingdom	8 400	36 826	531	45 757	78.63
United States[c]	4 587	70 765	10 218	85 570	..
Vanuatu	102	109	5	216	246.06
Venezuela	14 663	7 857	680	23 200	112.01

[a]The figures for Uganda were supplied by a non-governmental organization.
[b]Central government prisons only.
[c]Federal government prisons only.

Operations of Criminal Justice Systems (A/CONF.169/15, table 9).* In many countries, the prison population has continued to grow, notwithstanding increased use and reliance on alternative measures, also as a consequence of high crime rates.

B. Registration, separation of categories and classification

6. Almost all responding countries reported, in accordance with Rule 7, that a bound registration book was kept in every place where persons were imprisoned, containing information on the identity of all prisoners, the reason for their commitment and the authority therefor, and the date and hour of their admission and release. They also reported that no person was received into an institution without a valid commitment order, of which details had previously been entered in the register. However, Barbados and Ireland reported that the dates of admission and release were recorded but not the time. Belarus reported that a card index was used instead of a registration book. Australia, the Netherlands and South Africa reported that registration was now computerized. The United States reported that the Federal Bureau of Prisons Office maintained a central file on each inmate.

7. Almost all countries reported that male and female prisoners were either detained in separate institutions or, where they were in an institution which received both men and women, the whole of the premises allocated for women was entirely separate (Rule 8 (a)). Cameroon and Denmark reported that male and female prisoners were usually but not always held separately, in Cameroon for resource reasons and in Denmark because of the belief that there were advantages in this practice. Cameroon anticipated reforms in the foreseeable future. Germany reported that the principle of separate accommodation might be relaxed to enable prisoners to take part in treatment measures. Israel, too, reported that segregation was usual but that the sexes were sometimes detained in the same premises for reasons of medical care, psychological counselling and drug rehabilitation. Sweden reported that, because of resource difficulties and the belief that there were advantages in a different practice, segregation was usually but not always applied. The United States reported that a special housing unit might house male and female disciplinary cases on the same prison floor; however, they were separated. Reforms in this area were expected in the foreseeable future. Haiti reported that because of resource difficulties the segregation of male and female prisoners was exceptional.

8. Young prisoners were always kept entirely separate from adult prisoners in two thirds of responding countries. In a quarter, segregation was only usual; in Cameroon, Sweden and Venezuela, it was exceptional; and in Vanuatu, segregation was never applied (Rule 8 (d)). Most of the countries in which segregation was not always applied explained that it was because of shortage of resources, but others said it was due to their belief that there were sometimes advantages in not segregating young prisoners entirely from adult prisoners. For example, Denmark said that there was a very small number of young prisoners in institutions primarily for adults (from 5 to 10 in each such institution) and this was the reason for not enforcing total segregation. In Danish open prisons young prisoners could be with adults if it was considered to be in their interests. In Sweden, too, a combination of resource considerations and belief in the advantages of non-segregation were the reasons given for the fact that segregation was exceptional. In the United Kingdom (England and Wales) there were some limited circumstances where the mixing of young and adult male prisoners was allowed. Mixing of female young prisoners and adults was done on a regular basis as this practice had shown that both groups of prisoners profited by this experience. In the United States, juvenile offenders could be placed in an adult facility after turning 21, if there were no objections from the Court and where the transfer would not interfere with programming. Cameroon, Ireland and Sweden reported that reforms were expected in the foreseeable future.

---

*See also A/CONF.56/6, annex II.

9. The age at which young prisoners were considered to become adult prisoners was 18 in more than half the responding countries and 21 in nearly a quarter. Other countries reported that the age limit was 16, 17, 19 or 20, and that there were variations in different parts of their territory.

10. Untried prisoners were kept entirely separate from convicted prisoners in more than half of the responding countries (Rule 8 (b)). This practice was usually followed in other countries except in Colombia, Denmark, France and the United Kingdom (England and Wales) where it was followed only exceptionally and Haiti, Marshall Islands, Vanuatu and Venezuela where it was never followed. The United States reported that national law required separation of pre-trial offenders to the extent practicable, depending upon design, structure and operation of the individual institution. Most countries in which untried prisoners were not kept entirely separate from others said that this was due to difficulties concerning resources. Barbados, Cameroon, Ireland, Luxembourg, United Kingdom (England and Wales) and Venezuela were expecting reforms in the foreseeable future. Some countries which mentioned resources as a factor in not keeping untried prisoners entirely separate made additional comments: Australia noted that individual needs were sometimes better served by non-segregation; Denmark reported that in order to make maximal use of total prison capacity short-term prisoners were held with untried prisoners and segregation was exceptional; the Netherlands, where segregation of untried prisoners was usual, nonetheless reported it as an advantage to hold very short-term prisoners with untried ones; the United Kingdom (England and Wales) reported that segregation was exceptional but that unconvicted prisoners had the right to refuse the sharing of accommodation with those who were convicted.

11. In more than half of the responding countries, women prisoners were attended and supervised only by women officers (Rule 53 (3)); in a further quarter this was the usual practice while in 10 countries such a practice was followed exceptionally or never. Seven of these 10 (Australia, Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, Sweden and United Kingdom (England and Wales)) and also the Czech Republic, Finland, Slovakia and Switzerland believed that there were advantages for women prisoners in not being attended and supervised only by women officers. Germany reported that for a long time women had been able to be attended by male psychologists, doctors and social workers and it was now possible for this to occur in respect of warden duty and the direct care and control of prisoners. This was done in order to have the highest possible degree of normality in prison life (compared to life outside). Ireland mentioned the relevance of equal gender employment legislation to this issue. The Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom (England and Wales) and the United States pointed out that body searches could only be undertaken by women staff. Some countries (e.g. Côte d'Ivoire, Liechtenstein and Tajikistan) pointed out that application of this Rule was hampered by a shortage of women staff. The last two countries and Cameroon anticipated reforms in the foreseeable future.

12. More than three quarters of responding countries reported that all prisoners had a right to inform at once their families of their imprisonment on their transfer to another institution (Rule 44 (3)) and that this Rule was always applied. Other countries reported that this Rule was usually applied but not always. In the United States, an inmate initially committed was permitted to telephone his or her family. Inmates being transferred, however, might be advised of a destination, but not the date or time of transfer. In Cameroon and Venezuela it was only exceptionally applied; this was for resource reasons and reforms were expected. In the Russian Federation and Singapore the responsibility for notifying families of these events was entrusted to the prison administration.

C. Accommodation, personal hygiene, bedding and food

13. One sixth of responding countries reported that prisoners always occupied sleeping accommodation in individual cells or rooms during the night (Rule 9 (1)). Almost a quarter said that this practice was usually followed, most but not all indicating that resource difficulties prevented full application of this Rule. More than half indicated that single-occupancy of a cell or room occurred exceptionally or never. Again resource

difficulties were the explanation given in most cases. However, Australia, Belgium, Croatia, Malaysia and Turkey reported that they saw advantages in housing prisoners other than in separate cells or cubicles.

14. Prisoners who shared accommodation were always carefully chosen as being suitable to associate with one another in more than half of responding countries with such accommodation (Rule 9 (2)), and this practice was usually followed almost everywhere else. However, Colombia, Haiti, Tajikistan and Venezuela reported that this Rule was applied exceptionally or never. In the United States, staff reviewed inmates' records to ensure that prisoners with incompatible backgrounds (for example, religion, gangs) were not assigned to the same cells/cubicles. Haiti noted that this was because of resource difficulties; Tajikistan reported their belief that there were advantages in following a different practice. Venezuela expected reforms in the foreseeable future.

15. Those countries which had dormitory accommodation were asked to indicate the maximum number of prisoners at present placed in such a room. In more than a third it was over 40, while in a quarter it was no more than 10 (see table 2).

Table 2. Maximum number of prisoners at present in one dormitory room

Number of prisoners	*Number of countries*
No more than 10	13
More than 10 but not more than 20	9
More than 20 but not more than 30	6
More than 30 but not more than 40	5
More than 40	19

16. In a quarter of countries which use dormitory accommodation (Rule 9 (2)), the maximum size of such rooms was in excess of 120 m^2 (see table 3).

Table 3. Maximum size of dormitory rooms

Size of room (m^2)	*Number of countries*
40 or less	11
41-60	10
61-80	6
81-100	5
101-120	7
More than 120	14

17. Rule 10 requires that all accommodation provided for the use of prisoners and in particular all sleeping accommodation meet all requirements of health, due regard being paid to climatic conditions and particularly to cubic content of air, minimum floor space, lighting, heating and ventilation. Nearly half of responding countries had up to 3 m^2 of available floor space, but five countries reported having more than 10 m^2 (see

table 4). Nearly half had a cubic volume of air per prisoner of no more than 10 m^3 but six countries reported having more than 30 m^3 (see table 5).

Table 4. Floor space per prisoner

Size of room (m^2)	*Number of countries*
Up to 3	23
3-5	15
6-10	13
11-15	4
More than 15	1

Table 5. Cubic air space per prisoner

Size of room (m^3)	*Number of countries*
Up to 10	25
11-30	23
31-50	3
More than 50	3

18. The five countries reporting that they provided more than 10 m^2 of floor space per prisoner were Belgium, Chile, Liechtenstein, Mexico and Republic of Korea. The six countries reporting that they provided more than 30 m^3 of air space per prisoner were Armenia, Belgium, Costa Rica, Jordan, Liechtenstein and Mauritius.

19. The temperature in the accommodation provided for prisoners was generally never less than 15° or 20° C. However, nine countries reported minima of 10° C (Australia, Chile, Israel, Peru and Portugal) or 5° C (Colombia, Malawi, South Africa and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia). The maximum temperature was generally 25°, 30° or 35° C. However, Cameroon, Colombia, Haiti, Myanmar and South Africa reported that it might be as high as 40° C. The greatest ranges of temperature were thus in Colombia and South Africa (from 5° to 40° C); the smallest (a variation of only 5° C in each case) were reported by Armenia, Finland, Qatar and the United States.

20. Most countries reported that all places where prisoners were required to live or work had windows and that all were constructed to allow the entry of fresh air (Rule 11 (a)). However, more than a sixth said that almost all places had windows and more than a quarter said that not all the windows were constructed to allow the entry of fresh air. In the United States, about half of the windows were constructed to allow the entry of fresh air. New facilities had operable windows but officers exercised discretion in the light of security concerns and balancing the use of ventilation and air conditioning. In the Marshall Islands, none of their accommodation had windows. The Netherlands reported that only a quarter of prison windows were constructed to allow the entry of fresh air but that in all other cases the rooms had air-conditioning.

21. Similarly most countries reported that all windows in living accommodation were constructed to enable the prisoner to read or work by natural light (Rule 11 (a)). However, more than a quarter said that almost all were so constructed or that most were.

22. Artificial light was available in almost all countries (Rule 11 (b)). However, not all prisoners had such a facility in Cambodia, Côte d'Ivoire, Haiti, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica and Pakistan. These countries, and also Latvia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mongolia and South Africa reported that the artificial light available was not always strong enough to make reading and writing possible.

23. Rule 13 requires that adequate bathing and shower installations shall be provided so that every prisoner may be enabled and required to have a bath or shower, at a temperature suitable to the climate, as frequently as necessary for general hygiene according to season and geographical region, but at least once a week in a temperate climate. In almost all countries prisoners were entitled to take a bath or shower at least once a week, but not always with hot water. In the Islamic Republic of Iran the frequency was less than once a week; it depended on prisoners' behaviour in Malaysia and Pakistan (see table 6). If there were exceptional

circumstances, some countries reported that the frequency of entitlement might drop and the chances of the water being cold might increase; but most countries indicated that even if there were exceptional circumstances, the above practice would be maintained.

Table 6. Frequency of entitlement to bath or shower

Frequency	*With hot water*	*With water that was always or sometimes cold*
Less than once a week	1	-
At least once a week	17	1
At least twice a week	4	1
At least three times a week	4	10
At least daily/on request	18	11
Depends on prisoners' behaviour	-	2

24. Separate beds and bedding were always provided for prisoners in three quarters of responding countries (Rule 19). In Chile, Costa Rica, Pakistan and Romania beds and bedding were usually provided but resource problems prevented this happening in every case; in Israel and Morocco bedding was always provided but a number of prisoners had mattresses on the floor, as did all prisoners in Thailand where sleeping on a mattress on the floor was part of the traditional Thai culture. In some countries (e.g. Cameroon, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Haiti, Jamaica and Venezuela) beds and bedding were provided exceptionally or never. In the Islamic Republic of Iran and Iraq inability to provide beds and bedding for all prisoners was attributed to resource problems. In Tonga prisoners were required to provide their own bedding. Reforms were anticipated in Cameroon, Haiti, Jamaica and Venezuela.

25. More than three quarters of countries reported that all parts of institutions regularly used by prisoners were properly maintained and kept scrupulously clean at all times (Rule 14). In other countries, this condition applied to almost all or most institutions except in Colombia where it applied to a half.

26. Rule 20 (1) requires that every prisoner be provided by the administration at the usual hours with food of nutritional value adequate for health and strength, of wholesome quality and well-prepared and served. This rule was reported to be applied in all countries, though some said that the food was not always well served. Three States said that it was not well prepared (Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire and Tajikistan). Denmark pointed out that in some institutions the prisoners did their own cooking under a system of self-management. Mongolia said that meals were not always provided at the usual hours. Drinking water is to be available to every prisoner whenever needed (Rule 20 (2)). Three countries (Cameroon, Colombia and Pakistan) said that drinking water was not always available, because of resource difficulties.

D. Prison work

27. Less than a third of responding countries reported that there was sufficient work to keep all prisoners actively employed (Rule 71 (3)). A similar proportion said there was enough for almost all or most prisoners. A quarter had sufficient work only for half their prisoners, while Barbados, Chile, Italy, Jamaica, Latvia, Marshall Islands, Qatar, Turkey and Venezuela had sufficient work for a quarter, or fewer. Haiti reported that no work was available.

28. On a normal working day sentenced prisoners were required to work for between five and eight hours in almost every country in which prisoners were required to work. This was of course reduced when work was unavailable. Greece, Ireland, Netherlands, Peru, Qatar and Thailand reported that prisoners were

normally required to work less than five hours per day; Tonga indicated that nine hours work was required. Over a half of responding countries required prisoners to work for five days a week and nearly a third of the countries required six days a week. In a few countries there was some variation from week to week. In some countries (e.g. Malta and Saudi Arabia) prisoners were not required to work at all.

29. Nearly half of the responding countries provided opportunities for vocational training in useful trades to all, or almost all, prisoners (Rule 71 (5)). In more than a third of responding countries the opportunities were available for only a quarter of the prisoners, or fewer. Haiti reported that no such training was available. Latvia and Venezuela reported that reforms were expected by 1996.

30. The wages prisoners received for their work (Rule 76) continued to vary considerably. In the Marshall Islands, Peru, Republic of Korea, Syrian Arab Republic and Ukraine they were reported to receive between 91 and 100 per cent of the average wage paid to the prison officers of the lowest category. By contrast, no pay was received by prisoners in Myanmar, Papua New Guinea, Tonga and Vanuatu. In over a third of countries, the pay that was received was no more than 10 per cent of the level of pay of the lowest category of prison officers and in a similar number of countries the pay exceeded 10 per cent but was no more than 50 per cent of that level. In the United States, inmates received less than 3 per cent of the average salary for the lowest category of officers. Other inmates who worked in a special project received between 3 and 7 per cent of the average wage paid to the lowest category of prison officers, after reduction of mandatory contributions to pay off court-ordered financial obligations (fines for example).

E. Education and recreation

31. All prisoners were provided with education in one third of responding countries (Rule 77). In a further quarter, at least half the prisoners received education and in the remainder it was provided for no more than a quarter. In Haiti and Vanuatu no prisoner was provided with education. In the United States, education programmes ranged from basic literacy to the post-secondary level. Mandatory literacy programme participation was a requirement for all prisoners in Federal institutions who did not possess a high school diploma or a general education degree certificate. Young prisoners were more likely to receive education than adults: in three fifths of responding countries education was available for all young prisoners and in another one fifth of countries it was available for at least a half of the prisoners. Cameroon, Jordan and Vanuatu reported that reforms were expected in the foreseeable future.

32. All illiterate prisoners were provided with education in half the responding countries (Rule 77 (1)). In another fifth of countries such education was provided for a majority of illiterate prisoners. No such education was provided in Tonga nor in the two countries where no education was available, that is, Haiti and Vanuatu (see preceding paragraph).

33. Rule 39 states that prisoners shall be kept informed regularly of the more important items of news by the reading of newspapers and periodicals, by hearing wireless transmissions or by any similar means as authorized or controlled by the administration. Côte d'Ivoire and Pakistan reported that prisoners had no access to radio, television, newspapers or the magazines. In Papua New Guinea such access was occasional or exceptional. Elsewhere the degree of access varied from countries in which prisoners had access to radio, television, newspapers and the magazines of their choice and for the whole of their leisure time (nearly a quarter of responding countries) to those in which there was a much more restricted access.

34. Prisoners had access for the whole of their leisure time to radio programmes of their choice in nearly half the responding countries and access on a more limited basis in a similar number of countries. However, there was no such access in Malawi, Myanmar or the three countries already noted as allowing no access to any such published or broadcast material. In Singapore access was allowed only to selected prisoners. Television programmes of their choice were available to prisoners for the whole of their leisure time in about two fifths of responding countries, available on a more limited basis in half of the countries and completely

unavailable in Côte d'Ivoire, Haiti, Malawi, Myanmar, Pakistan and Vanuatu. Newspapers and magazines were almost always available, but over a quarter of responding countries placed some restrictions on the choice.

35. In more than three quarters of responding countries young prisoners and those of suitable age and physique were permitted to participate in sports or physical education at least once a week or on request (Rule 21 (2)). Over a quarter of countries reported that such activities were permitted at least three times a week. In some countries permission depended on the behaviour of the young prisoners concerned. In Haiti the prisons were reported to have insufficient space to organize such activities.

36. Rule 21 (1) says that every prisoner who is not employed in outdoor work shall have at least one hour of suitable exercise in the open air daily if weather permits. Three quarters of responding countries reported full application of this Rule. In most of the others almost all prisoners were permitted to receive such exercise. However, in Armenia only some prisoners had this opportunity and in Haiti none at all did, again reportedly because of lack of space. In Japan prisoners were allowed 30 minutes exercise per day; prisoners were not allowed to exercise at weekends. In Cameroon and Pakistan most prisoners had at least an hour's daily exercise. In Côte d'Ivoire, Singapore and the United States permission was granted at the discretion of the administration. In several countries certain prisoners (e.g. those undergoing isolation punishment) were specified as exceptions to the normal mandatory practice of allowing daily exercise to every prisoner.

F. Medical services

37. Medical and dental services were available for all prisoners in almost every responding country (Rules 22 (1) and 22 (3)). In Colombia and Mongolia they were available for almost all prisoners and in Pakistan for most prisoners. In Chile and Haiti less than a quarter of prisoners had such services available.

38. Daily access to a qualified medical officer was always available in three quarters of responding countries and was usually available almost everywhere else (Rules 22 (1) and 25 (1)). But it was only exceptionally available, for resource reasons, in Barbados, Cameroon, Haiti, Jamaica and Venezuela. Reforms were anticipated in the foreseeable future in Haiti and Venezuela.

39. Ill prisoners who required specialist treatment were always transferred to specialized institutions or to civil hospitals (Rule 22 (2)) in the vast majority of responding countries.

40. Rule 23 (2) states that where nursing infants are allowed to remain in the institution with their mothers, provision shall be made for a nursery staffed by qualified persons, where the infants shall be placed when they are not in the care of their mothers. This Rule was applied in more than half the responding countries and in a number of others such facilities were available for most women prisoners with infant children. But about a quarter of countries reported that no such facilities existed and several pointed out that there was no need for a nursery, either because infants were not allowed inside the institution (as in China), because mothers were invariably allowed an interruption of their sentence for the period in which their infants were being nursed (as in Slovakia) or because the requirement that women prisoners shall work was regarded as being fulfilled, in the case of nursing mothers, by their full-time care of their children (as in Denmark). In Myanmar women undertook light work during which they were allowed to keep their babies with them. In Sri Lanka, too, mothers undertook the full-time care of their infants.

41. In accordance with Rule 91, it was possible in almost all countries for an untried prisoner to be visited and treated by his or her own doctor or dentist, if there was reasonable ground for the application and the prisoner was able to pay any expenses incurred. Eight countries reported that such an arrangement was not possible (Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Marshall Islands, Myanmar, Qatar, Romania, San Marino and Slovakia), and in France such an arrangement required ministerial authority. It was pointed out by the Marshall Islands that almost all the population of the country did not have the privilege of having his or her

own doctor. In the United States, all medical care was provided by the Federal Bureau of Prisons Office. Permission might be granted for examination by a private physician if the inmate was being treated for a major medical problem or if a warden and the medical director determined that the visit was reasonable and would not violate the best interests of any of the parties. Such visits were not routine and were infrequent.

G. Privileges and discipline or restraint

42. Three quarters of responding countries reported that privileges appropriate for the different classes of prisoners and the different methods of treatment were always established at every institution in order to encourage good conduct, develop a sense of responsibility and secure the interest and cooperation of the prisoners in their treatment. Most other countries reported that this was the usual practice. Mongolia and Slovakia noted this was only exceptionally done, and Denmark, Haiti, the Netherlands and Sweden reported that privileges were never used in this way. Denmark and the Netherlands believed that there were advantages in a different practice and Sweden said that, while there were no privileges established, consideration was given to prisoners' behaviour when deciding on, for example, short-time leave and leisure activities outside the prison.

43. The privileges that were used, *inter alia*, included: remission, parole, home leaves, extra or longer visits, more leisure activities, the right to decorate the cell or room, the right to work outside the prison gates, placement in work programmes, a more open regime or transfer to an open prison, travelling expenses for home visits, places on training courses, the use of the telephone, permission to engage in hobbies, permission to use musical instruments, credit points towards release on parole, longer exercise periods, more opportunity for sport, more use of television, extra food, a gratuity at the end of the sentence, use of video recorder, games, better work conditions, cancellation of disciplinary punishment, contact visits, activities outside the prison, participation in drama, permission to undertake employment in the community, the right to make more purchases from the prison shops, being given a position of trust or more responsibility, the right to have extra items in their cells and the award of good conduct badges.

44. Almost all responding countries reported that, in accordance with Rule 28 (1), prisoners were never allowed to exercise disciplinary functions over other prisoners. In Armenia and Pakistan this Rule was usually applied. It was only applied exceptionally in Cameroon and Myanmar where senior convicted prisoners were employed as watchmen in the dormitories to assist the night-duty prison officers. In several countries prisoners were given such authority in dormitories but it was reported that they did not have the right to discipline other prisoners.

45. In accordance with Rules 30 (1) and 30 (2), almost all responding countries reported that prisoners could only be punished in accordance with laws or regulations made known to them previously. In Cameroon, Colombia, Jordan, Morocco and Venezuela this was the usual practice but it was not always followed. In France it was not the practice in 1994, but reforms were expected in March 1995. In Haiti, too, it was not current practice.

46. In accordance with Rule 30 (2) almost all responding countries reported that prisoners were always given a proper opportunity to present their defence before the imposition of a disciplinary measure. In Cameroon, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire and Pakistan they were usually given such an opportunity but in Morocco, where it was reported that reforms were expected in the foreseeable future, and in Venezuela, prisoners were never given the opportunity to present a defence before a disciplinary measure was imposed.

47. A prisoner serving a punishment imposed for a disciplinary offence that might be prejudicial to his or her physical or mental health was visited daily by a medical officer in about one seventh of the responding countries (Rule 32 (3)). In more than half the countries such visits took place at least three times a week or on request. In another one seventh it was possible that visits would not take place more than once a week and in Morocco the frequency was less than once a week. Several countries said that the Rule did not apply

in their circumstances because they did not impose punishments that were prejudicial to the physical or mental health of prisoners (South Africa)), because no prisoner whose fitness for punishment was in doubt would be so punished (United Kingdom (England and Wales)) or because no disciplinary punishments were imposed at all (Liechtenstein).

48. Rule 31, which states that corporal punishment, punishment by placing in a dark cell and all cruel, inhuman or degrading punishments shall be completely prohibited as punishments for disciplinary offences, was reported to be always applied by more than four fifths of responding countries. Armenia, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Jordan and Venezuela reported that the Rule was usually applied, with the last two of these countries indicating that they did not always apply it because they saw advantages in a different practice; in Venezuela it was reported to be retained in the interests of security. In Pakistan, Papua New Guinea and Tonga such punishments were only exceptionally forbidden and in the Marshall Islands, San Marino and Singapore they were never forbidden. In Singapore, the Prison Act provided for the imposition of caning on prisoners who had committed aggravated prison offences.

49. Almost all responding countries reported that instruments of restraint, such as handcuffs, chains, irons and strait-jackets, were never used as a punishment (Rule 33). Malawi, Marshall Islands, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea and Vanuatu reported that the Rule was only exceptionally applied and San Marino and Venezuela stated that the Rule was never applied. Several countries referred to their use of handcuffs as a restraint but not as a punishment.

50. According to Rule 29 (b), the types and duration of punishment which may be inflicted must be determined by the law or by the regulation of the competent administrative authority. In most countries the severest disciplinary punishment was close confinement or isolation. About a quarter of responding countries reported that the maximum period allowed for this punishment was 10 days or less. In more than a quarter it was between 11 and 20 days and in about a quarter it was between 21 and 30 days. In the Philippines it was between 31 and 40 days. In most of the remainder the maximum period for which such punishments might be imposed was in excess of 40 days (France, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Thailand and the United States). In Barbados and San Marino no limit was set. Some countries set a maximum for strict isolation at no more than about 20 days but had a system of close confinement in less strict conditions which could be imposed for longer. Member States were not asked, when giving the above information, to indicate the severity of conditions.

H. Information to and complaints by prisoners

51. Five sixths of responding countries reported that every prisoner on admission was provided with information about the regulations governing the treatment of prisoners of his or her category, the disciplinary requirements of the institution and the authorized methods of seeking information and making complaints (Rule 35). Five other countries reported that the Rule was usually applied. Six countries reported that while prisoners were informed of the regulations governing their treatment, they were not always told about the disciplinary requirements and the means of seeking information and making complaints. In Pakistan, Rule 35 was only applied exceptionally and in Haiti never. In the latter case it was pointed out that the prison regimes were not yet clearly established.

52. Five sixths of responding countries reported that prisoners had the opportunity of making requests or complaints to the director of the institution or the officer authorized to represent him, every day or on request or at least three times a week (Rule 36 (1)). In Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Papua New Guinea and Vanuatu such an opportunity was available usually or with exceptions; in Chile, Croatia, Morocco, Myanmar, Pakistan, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey it was available at least once a week, in the Islamic Republic of Iran its availability depended on the behaviour of the prisoner and in Mexico no such opportunity was reported to be available.

53. In accordance with Rule 36 (3)), almost every responding country reported that prisoners could make a request or complaint without censorship to the central prison administration, the judicial authority or other proper authorities through approved channels. However, in Myanmar, it was reported that such complaints were censored and in Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Republic of Korea and Vanuatu, prisoners might complain in confidence to the central prison administration only. In other countries there was usually uncensored recourse not only to the central prison administration but also to a judicial authority and often also to bodies such as the Ombudsman, the Ministry of Justice, parliamentary representatives, the prosecutor, their lawyer, visiting magistrates, commissions entrusted with controlling the prisons and sometimes to the head of state, the President, and to international human rights bodies.

I. Inspection

54. Almost all countries reported that penal institutions and services were regularly inspected (Rule 55). Only Barbados, Colombia, Luxembourg and Venezuela indicated that there were no regular inspections. Inspections were undertaken by a variety of bodies, including the prison administration staff, the Ministry responsible for prisons, the prosecuting authorities, the Ombudsman (where one existed) and sometimes by national and international human rights bodies.

55. If the inspections were independent of the prison administration itself there arose the question of whether the head of the administration was required to follow the recommendations of the inspector and whether, even if he was not required by law to do so, in actual practice he followed them as far as possible. In more than half the responding countries the head of prison administration had to follow the inspector's recommendations and almost everywhere else he was not required to follow them but did so as far as possible. In Sri Lanka he had to take action on the recommendations, but only to the extent that seemed expedient to him. In the Marshall Islands, Myanmar and Papua New Guinea there was no direct influence of the inspector's recommendations on the practice followed by the prison administration. In Côte d'Ivoire the inspector's report went to the Ministry of Justice where decisions about implementing the recommendations were made. In Turkey inspections were undertaken at least every three months by the local prosecutor who was then himself responsible for the implementation of the measures for improvement that he had proposed.

J. Legal counselling

56. Rule 93 sets out the legal assistance which an untried prisoner should be allowed for the purposes of his or her defence. Five sixths of countries reported that prisoners might apply for free legal aid where it was available. Prisoners might receive visits from their legal advisers with a view to the preparation of their defence in all responding countries with the exception of the Philippines and San Marino. Prisoners might prepare and hand confidential instructions to their legal advisers in five sixths of responding countries.

57. Interviews between the prisoner and his or her legal adviser took place within the hearing of a police or prison official in Australia, Jordan, Liechtenstein, Marshall Islands, Netherlands, Pakistan, Slovakia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. They took place within the sight but not the hearing of such an official in most other countries, but interviews were reported to be completely private in Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Japan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Sweden, Turkey and Ukraine.

K. Contact with the outside world

58. Rule 37 states that prisoners shall be allowed under necessary supervision to communicate with their family and reputable friends at regular intervals, both by correspondence and by receiving visits. In respect of visits there was a wide variation of practice, for example, between those countries which permitted visits no more than once a month and those that allowed them more than six times a month or on request. Latvia and Tajikistan allowed less than one visit per month and Slovakia allowed visits every six weeks to prisoners classified in its third correctional group. The following countries allowed visits once a month: Armenia,

Barbados, Belarus, China, Czech Republic, Germany, Mauritius, Mongolia, Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Ukraine and Vanuatu. By contrast the following countries allowed more than six visits a month: Cameroon, Chile, Costa Rica, Finland, Greece, Haiti, Jamaica, Lebanon, Malawi, Mexico, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Tonga and Venezuela; Côte d'Ivoire and Sweden reported that visits were allowed on request (with exceptions). In the United States, prisoners might receive visits for four hours a month subject to restrictions for disciplinary reasons.

59. Several countries allowed more frequent visits to pre-trial detainees than to sentenced prisoners. For example, Belgium and France both allowed four visits a month to sentenced prisoners but six (Belgium) or more than six (France) to pre-trial detainees. Japan allowed visits once a month to sentenced prisoners but every weekday to pre-trial detainees. Myanmar allowed two visits a month to sentenced prisoners but four or five to detainees. Portugal allowed four visits a month to sentenced prisoners but daily visits to detainees. Such practice reflects the spirit of those Rules (especially Rules 84 (2) and 92) which emphasize that unconvicted prisoners are presumed to be innocent and shall be treated as such and that they shall be given all reasonable facilities for communicating with family and friends and for receiving visits from them, subject only to such restrictions and supervision as are necessary in the interests of the administration of justice and of the security and good order of the institution.

60. Prisoners could receive and send mail either on request or more than six times a month in more than three quarters of responding countries. In the United States, mail privileges were unrestricted. However, an inmate might be placed on restricted general correspondence if the inmate was found to be abusing mail privileges. In Malaysia and Qatar the frequency of correspondence allowed depended on the behaviour of the prisoners. No more than two letters a month were normally allowed in Barbados, Mauritius, Papua New Guinea, Sri Lanka and also in Singapore, where the director of the institution nevertheless had authority to grant extra letters especially to those who were of exemplary conduct.

L. Religion

61. If the institution contained a sufficient number of prisoners of the same religion, a qualified representative of that religion was always appointed or approved in more than three quarters of responding countries and this practice was usually followed elsewhere (Rule 41 (1)). In the United States, each institution had at least one chaplain; however, volunteer or contract staff might be utilized to perform specific religious services not handled by the chaplain. A qualified representative of another religion was usually appointed or approved, subject to the availability of local resources. In Saudi Arabia such a representative was only exceptionally appointed or approved and in Haiti, Latvia and Mongolia this practice was never followed. In Haiti this was because of resource problems; in Latvia reforms were expected by 1996. South Africa pointed out that 1,815 representatives and 30 chaplains had been appointed for 65 different churches and denominations.

62. Access to a qualified representative of any religion was never refused to any prisoner in five sixths of responding countries (Rule 41 (3)) and rarely refused elsewhere; refusals were often because a particular religion was not recognized. Colombia reported that such access was usually refused, in China due to the belief that there were advantages in a different practice and in Colombia because religious leaders were seen as using their role for politics and proselytizing. In Haiti, for resource reasons, access was always refused, as it was in Saudi Arabia due to the belief that there were advantages in a different practice.

63. Prisoners were allowed to have books of religious observance in their possession (Rule 42) in almost every responding country. In Papua New Guinea there were exceptions to this practice; in Cameroon and Côte d'Ivoire prisoners were usually allowed to keep religious books in their possession while in Tonga such permission depended entirely on the administration.

M. Institutional personnel

64. Member States were asked, in respect of specialists, how many of various types of personnel were currently employed in their prison system (see annex). They were asked to distinguish full-time from part-time staff. In the annex to this report, an overview on specialists employed in the prison systems is provided. In each case the number of part-time staff is added in parentheses after the number of full-time staff. In some countries certain specialists (e.g. teachers) were employed not by the prison administration but by an outside body and this accounts for their absence from the figures in the annex.

N. Social relations and after-care

65. Rule 81 (1) states that so far as is possible, released prisoners shall be provided with appropriate documents and identification papers, have suitable homes and work to go to, be suitably and adequately clothed having regard to the climate and season, and have sufficient means to reach their destination and maintain themselves in the period immediately following their release. Less than half the responding countries reported that after-care services were available for all prisoners; in a further seventh they were available for a majority of prisoners. However more than a fifth of respondents said that such services were available only for some prisoners; no services were available in Haiti, Marshall Islands, Myanmar, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Tonga or Venezuela. The Islamic Republic of Iran, Jordan, Latvia and Malta expected reforms in the foreseeable future.

II. ROLE OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

66. It is apparent that the non-governmental organizations that submitted replies to the Secretary-General reported on the use and application of the Standard Minimum Rules from a somewhat different perspective. Penal Reform International, which reported on the observance of the Rules in Uganda, noted some difficulties in the separation of prisoners, i.e. juveniles and the separation of untried detainees from convicted prisoners. Juveniles who committed capital offences or those who were caught in the act with adult offenders were usually considered as dangerous and were imprisoned together with adults. Owing to the poor communication system in Uganda, families were not always informed of the imprisonment of one of their relatives. It also reported difficulties in the provision of adequate accommodation. Because of the overcrowding of prisons, selection of prisoners who associate with one another was only exceptionally practiced. Also, more than 40 prisoners were placed in one dormitory room. This organization noted that since nothing was done to reduce or increase temperatures in the accommodation, they depended on the weather. Prisons in Uganda were constructed without windows. Because of prison overcrowding, prisoners were only exceptionally provided with blankets or mattresses. With regard to the provision of food, this organization reported that prisoners received one meal in a day in very insufficient quantities and that the diet was never balanced. Water in prisons was consumed raw. According to this organization, the prison administration faced difficulties in the provision of work. Skills and trade training facilities in Ugandan prisons were very inadequate compared to the large number of prisoners. Where they were available, usually spares and materials were lacking to keep them running. In addition, prisoners in Uganda did not receive any wages for the work they did. Prisoners in Uganda had no access to printed or broadcast information. Due to the poor funding of the prison department in Uganda, prisoners did not receive any education, despite the fact that the Prison Act of Uganda provided for it. This organization reported that the laws of Uganda provided for corporal punishment or the placing of prisoners in a dark cell. With regard to information and complaints by prisoners, Penal Reform International reported that any information leaving or entering a prison was subject to censorship by prison administrators.

67. The Andean Commission of Jurists reported on the application of the Rules in Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela. With regard to legal provisions, most of these countries ensured that the Rules were applied, *inter alia*, in the areas of registration of prisoners, separation of prisoners (i.e. untried prisoners

from those convicted, women from men, juveniles from adults) and in meeting minimal accommodation standards. Also, the law provided for education, training and recreation facilities, as well as for work in at least some of these countries. In Chile and Peru, prisoners had access to printed and broadcast information. In addition, the law provided for health-care services for prisoners. However, this organization reported that, in Venezuela, valid orders for detention were not required for persons who were detained in accordance with the *ley de vagos y maleantes*. In Bolivia, men and women might be detained in the same building, but the law provided for separation within the building. In Chile, the transfer of sick prisoners to civil or private hospitals, if required, was applied only in exceptional and very serious cases. The maximum duration of isolation was reported to be 30 days in Peru which could be extended to 45 days in cases of recidivism. In Chile, prisoners could make petitions or complaints only if this was regarded as necessary by the prison administration. In Chile and Venezuela, visits were allowed twice a week and in maximum security prisons in Ecuador, visits were allowed only under special regulations and with special precautions. However, in the view of this organization, a gap existed between legal provisions and the implementation of these provisions in practice in many countries.

III. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

68. In order to overcome these apparent difficulties in the application of the Rules, Member States indicated what forms of assistance they considered to be helpful to their Governments and what forms of assistance, if any, their Governments could provide to other countries.

69. The 45 countries which made a request indicated the forms of assistance that would be helpful to their Governments. Exchange of experience was requested most frequently and was most often accorded the highest priority. Assistance with training and with research were requested the next most often, while financial aid was the form of assistance given the second highest priority. Fourteen countries requested all six forms of assistance. The nature of requests for assistance are given in greater detail in table 7.

Table 7. Requests for assistance

Type of assistance requested	*Number of requesting countries*
Exchange of experience	40
Training	36
Research	30
Financial aid	28
Planning	24
Legal reform	19

70. Offers to provide assistance were made by 39 countries. Most frequently, States offered exchange of experience (29); assistance in training (18); assistance in legal reform (15) and research (14). Planning could be provided by 10 countries and financial aid by another 2 countries.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

71. In comparing the two surveys which have been mentioned above, some positive trends are observed. For example, prisoners were allowed to take a bath or shower more often than in the past. Countries reported that medical and dental services were available for more prisoners now than in the past. Fewer prisoners

were allowed to exercise disciplinary functions over other prisoners. Corporal punishment appeared to be used less than during the previous reporting period. Comparisons with the results of the previous survey suggest that prisoners receive better information than in the past, *inter alia*, on regulations governing their treatment and possibilities of making requests or complaints.

72. Apparent negative trends included the following: separation of different categories of prisoners was reported to be a problem for prison management in more countries than in the past. More unconvicted prisoners shared cells with convicted prisoners and more young prisoners were kept in institutions for adult prisoners. More female prisoners had to share prisons with males. It was also more likely that women prisoners were supervised by male officers during the reporting period than five years ago. In 1995, more dormitories were used than in 1990. In some countries, prison management did not select prisoners for the occupation of dormitories as carefully as in the past. As regards prison buildings, not all windows were constructed to allow the entry of fresh air in modern prisons. In more countries than before, possibly because of prison overcrowding, beds and bedding were no longer provided for all prisoners. Fewer countries reported that their prisons were kept clean. With regard to prison work, prisoners in fewer countries had the opportunity to work. In fewer countries a prisoner was likely to receive education or recreation than in the past. Fewer countries reported that prisoners were allowed to communicate with the outside world, particularly with their family and reputable friends, than for the period covered by the 1990 report. Social relations and after-care services were available in fewer countries than in the past.

Notes

[1]See *First United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, Geneva, 22 August-3 September 1955: report prepared by the Secretariat* (United Nations publication, Sales No. 1956.IV.4), annex I.A; see also *Compendium of United Nations Standards and Norms in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.92.IV.1), sect. C.

Annex

SPECIALISTS EMPLOYED IN THE PRISON SYSTEMS

Country/area	*Number of prisoners*	*Doctors*	*Nurses*	*Psychiatrists*	*Psychologists*	*Social workers*	*Teachers*	*Trade instructors*	*Others*
Armenia	5 364	37(+8)	-	6	1	-	19	-	-
Australia[a]	17 821	15(+58)	158(+47)	6(+12)	89(+11)	58(+4)	153(+505)	568	194(+27)
Belarus	42 100	368(+51)	315(+16)	51(+14)	52	-	70(+2)	29(+258)	5 700(+55)
Belgium	7 420	2(+54)	75	-	29(+3)	206(+2)	0(+1)	-	7[b]
Cameroon	18 230	3(+65)	128	0(+1)	0(+1)	60	-	-	20
Chile	19 978	4(+40)	10	2	26	116	5	-	150
Colombia	28 551	0(+211)	85	0(+6)	32	27	104	-	2(+70)
Costa Rica	3 605	20	3	3	30	65	19	-	165
Côte d'Ivoire	12 215	1	16	-	-	11	-	-	-
Croatia	2 306	26(+10)	51(+10)	6(+2)	12	9	14(+3)	60	-
Cyprus	164	1(+2)	6	0(+1)	1	1	1(+10)	10	-
Czech Republic	16 567	107(+74)	200(+3)	2(+3)	41(+8)	61	18	39(+7)	51[c]
Denmark[d]	3 195	7(+26)	36(+39)	5	4(+1)	55(+8)	66(+6)	298	2(+3)
Finland	3 322	6(+15)	107	5(+2)	23(+2)	40	17	250	0(+7)[e]
Germany[f]	59 966	285.5	N.A.	N.A.	434.5	1 127	413.4	1 970	-
Greece	6 884	4(+48)	19	2(+8)	-	48	-	-	-
Haiti	N.A.	3	4	-	-	8	-	-	-
Ireland	2 012	0(+20)	-	0(+9)	5	34	109(+69)	60	2[g]
Israel	6 280	28(+10)	14	-	2(+3)	85(+17)	85(+2)	36(+7)	115(+4)[h]
Italy	51 696	15 (+1 748)	314 (+1 340)	0(+260)	1(+407)	1 300	-	-	6[i]
Jamaica	4 093	1(+1)	2	0(+1)	-	10	6	30	50[j]
Japan	39 220	196 (+2 683)	244	26(+11)	89	-	110(+93)	571(+91)	89(+5)[k]
Jordan	3 749	5(+7)	6	0(+4)	-	3(+1)	6	-	4[l]
Latvia	9 457	41(+21)	71(+20)	10(+1)	2	136(+3)	14	5	-
Lebanon	3 780	3(+15)	5(+7)	-	-	5(+10)	5(+10)	5(+10)	10(+15)[m]
Liechtenstein	9	0(+1)	-	0(+1)	0(+1)	0(+2)	0(+2)	0(+1)	-
Luxembourg	418	1(+1)	6	0(+1)	0(+1)	0(+7)	1(+3)	11	2[n]
Malawi	4 685	1	1	4	4	-	-	6	-
Malta	193	1	2(+6)	0(+1)	-	-	0(+12)	-	-
Malaysia	19 850	1	-	-	-	-	9	52	-
Marshall Islands	156	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mauritius	926	2	28	-	-	6	8	108	-
Mongolia	6 085	45(+12)	77	1	-	-	8	3	-
Morocco	40 067	36(+50)	153	-	-	29	89	-	38
Myanmar	53 195	20(+22)	26	-	-	-	-	63	-
Papua New Guinea[o]	N.A.	-	1	-	-	0(+19)	0(+19)	10(+20)	1
Philippines	35 864	32	60	1	8	5	35	18	-
Portugal	11 252	38(+58)	69	10(+7)	-	[p]	43(+184)	-	-
Qatar[q]	527	1	5	-	1	3	-	-	-
Republic of Korea	55 159	59	59	-	-	-	290(+152)	90(+141)	-
Romania	43 990	208(+4)	341	5	11	-	304	196	35[r]

Country/area	*Number of prisoners*	*Doctors*	*Nurses*	*Psychiatrists*	*Psychologists*	*Social workers*	*Teachers*	*Trade instructors*	*Others*
Saudi Arabia	7 929 (sentenced prisoners)	1	1	-	1	2	10	20	1[a]
Singapore	7 273	6	75	2	1	-	13(+6)	-	-
Slovakia	7 275	56(+75)	160(+14)	6(+2)	39	15	-	-	7
South Africa	114 047	..	309	..	45	236	129	818	667
Sri Lanka	11 666	14(+6)	46	1	-	47	1(+25)	101	2(+4)[b]
Sweden	5 461	1(+73)	75(+55)	3(+17)	7(+8)	137(+6)	-	504(+30)	30(+1)[c]
Syrian Arab Republic	N.A.	4(+8)	10(+4)	1(+1)	1(+1)	7(+3)	14	20(+9)	-
Tajikistan	4 203	47	41	6	-	-	57	-	-
Thailand	93 652	48(+3)	238	-	179	37	279	1,594	3
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	1 178	3(+6)	4	1(+8)	17	10	14	20(+4)	-
Tonga	85	0(+1)	0(+1)	0(+1)	0(+1)	0(+1)	-	-	-
Turkey	34 355	99	-	54	54	49	130	-	119
Ukraine	160 592	808	2 212 (+314)	241	128	2 324	174(+20)	253	2 040
United Kingdom (England and Wales)	45 757	135(+103)	879	-	163	617(+45)	-	1 256	23[d]
United States	85 570	179(+6)	428(+14)	14	297(+31)	1 091	481	101	2 958(+6)
Venezuela	23 200	0(+109)	-	0(+8)	0(+19)	69	-	-	28(+70)[e]

[a] Medical services for one of the largest jurisdictions, provided by the health department, were excluded.
[b] Other specialists were 3 pharmacists and 4 industrial engineers.
[c] Other specialists were pedagogues.
[d] Additional specialists - social workers, health staff, teachers - were employed in local gaols. The 5 "others" were medical laboratory assistants.
[e] Other specialists were priests and health-care personnel.
[f] Includes part-time workers and is based on budgets for 1994. There may be some vacancies.
[g] Other specialists were the Director of Prison Medical Services and one pharmacist.
[h] Other specialists include 15(+2) rehabilitation experts, 87(+2) paramedical staff and 13 rabbinical staff.
[i] Other specialists were medical radiology engineers and nutrition experts.
[j] Other specialists were medical orderlies.
[k] Other specialists were 89 medical staff plus 5 interpreters and electricians.
[l] Other specialists were religious instructors.
[m] Other specialists were dentists.
[n] Other specialists were educators.
[o] For medical and psychiatric treatment, including psychologists and social workers who voluntarily visit prisoners and provide social activities, the government specialists were used.
[p] Social workers were employed not by the prison service but by the Institute for Social Rehabilitation.
[q] The prison works closely with Hamad Hospital in different medical fields and receives periodic visits.
[r] Other specialists were priests and some engineers.
[s] Other specialists was a barber.
[t] Other specialists were dental surgeons and counsellors.
[u] Other specialist were 30 physical therapists and one part-time recreation assistant.
[v] Other specialists were pharmacists.
[w] Other specialists include sporting/cultural coordinators, chaplains and dentists.